

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

Claims 3, 6, 12-14, 16, 18-20 and 38 are amended herein. Claims 3-27 and 37-38 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

Using independent claim 12 as an example, this claim recites writing and displaying a program list including program guide information of a currently displayed channel. In contrast, Mankovitz teaches an embodiment discussed at column 5, line 30 to column 6, line 55 therein. With respect to this embodiment, the search for guide information is conducted when the television is off. Specifically, if the television 14 is on, it is desirable that the controller 750 delays the search and will eventually detect a period of time in which the television 14 is off. Mankovitz, col. 5, ln. 43 to col. 5, ln. 56.

In the "Response to Arguments" portion of the Office Action, the Examiner refers to column 6, lines 9-34 of Mankovitz. However, this portion discusses the operation when the television is off, and therefore there is no currently displayed channel, as claimed.

Column 8, lines 11-28 of Mankovitz discuss another embodiment, in which the viewer may display channels while the VCR 740 scans other television sources. According to this embodiment, the viewer watches one of the television signal sources (i.e., cable, satellite, antenna) and the controller scans the remaining television signal sources. For example, if the viewer is watching satellite, the controller scans through cable for guide information, and if no guide information is found, the controller scans through antenna signals for guide information. However, in this example, the controller would not scan through satellite for guide information. Since Mankovitz does not scan the television signal source of the displayed program, this reference does not teach displaying a program list including program guide information of a currently viewed channel, as claimed.

Claim 6 recites acquiring the program guide information for each channel by searching for the accessible channels in a same source as the viewed channel in a background operation while the program list is referred to. As discussed above, Column 8, lines 11-28 of Mankovitz teach searching sources different from the source of the viewed channel.

The remaining references do not overcome these deficiencies.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections is requested.

CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. And further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited. At a minimum, this Amendment should be entered at least for purposes of Appeal as it either clarifies and/or narrows the issues for consideration by the Board.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited and possibly concluded by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss any such remaining issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 3-28-07

By: 

Michael J. Badagliacca
Registration No. 39,099

1201 New York Avenue, N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501